



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/746,880      | 12/22/2000  | David John Tyrrell   | 16,496              | 9383             |

23556 7590 12/26/2002

KIMBERLY-CLARK WORLDWIDE, INC.  
401 NORTH LAKE STREET  
NEENAH, WI 54956

EXAMINER

WEBB, JAMISUE A

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

3761

DATE MAILED: 12/26/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/746,880

Applicant(s) *He*

TYRRELL ET AL.

Examiner

Jamisue A. Webb

Art Unit

3761

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 21 January 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) rejected: 1-5, 8-15, 20-29, 32-35, 40, 41, 43 and 45-56.Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 6, 7, 16-19, 30, 31, 36-39, 42, 44 and 48.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☒ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 15.
10. ☒ Other: See Continuation Sheet

*Weilun Lo*  
WEILUN LOSUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: With regards to the 1449s submitted 8/19/02 and 10/1/02: A signed copy of the 1449 submitted 8/19/02 is attached, in regards to the IDS submitted 10/1/02 this is not being considered, see attached correspondence as to reasons. In response to Applicant's argument that the Examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgement on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account, only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. In re McLaughlin, 443 F.2d 1392; 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). With respect to applicant's arguments that Beerse does not provide motivation for selecting the polysaccharides/polyacrylamide polymers from the long list provided from Beerse. The Krysik patent discloses a lotion, the Beerse patent discloses a lotion composition with an additional skin moisturizing component. Beerse provides the motivation to add the moisturizing component to the Krysik patent. The motivation to combine comes from adding the skin moisturizing component to Krysik. Beerse then names a list of suitable moisturizing components (which the examiner considers capable of acting as a thickening agent), which include the polysaccharide/polyacrylamide. With respect to the applicant's arguments that Beerse does not provide motivation to put the thickening agent in a lotion. Beerse, in column 4, lines 3-4 disclose the composition being used in lotions and wipes, therefore there exist a motivation to combine.

Continuation of 10. Other: See attached correspondence with regards to the IDS submitted 10/1/02.

***Information Disclosure Statement***

1. The information disclosure statement filed 10/1/02 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.97(d) because it lacks a statement as specified in 37 CFR 1.97(e). It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.